IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE EASTERN DIVISION

ROBERT HOLMAN,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) No. 1:21-cv-01085-STA-jay
THOMAS J. VILSACK, in his official capacity as Secretary of Agriculture; and ZACH DUCHENEAUX, in his official capacity as Administrator of the Farm Service Agency, Defendants.)))))))))

DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF IN EXCESS OF PAGE LIMITS

Defendants Thomas J. Vilsack, in his official capacity as Secretary of Agriculture, and Zach Ducheneaux, in his official capacity as Administrator of the Farm Service Agency (collectively, "Defendants," or "USDA"), hereby seek leave to file the attached Reply in Support of their Motion to Dismiss that is two pages over the 10-page limit provided by Local Rules

12.1(c). Counsel for Defendants have conferred with counsel for Plaintiff, who indicated that

Plaintiff opposes this motion.

Good cause supports Defendants' request for a modest, two-page extension to their Reply brief. Defendants moved to dismiss two claims in Plaintiff's Complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and for failure to state a claim. Defendants did not seek an extension to the page limits provided by the Local Rules for their brief in support of their Motion to Dismiss. Plaintiff's opposition brief responds to Defendants' asserted grounds for dismissal and raises new

arguments—including asserting additional bases for Article III standing and various new contentions relating to the interpretation of "debt forgiveness" that were not contained in Plaintiff's Complaint or briefed at the preliminary injunction stage¹—that Defendants have not had the opportunity to address.

As Defendants' attached Reply brief shows, the modest two-page extension is necessary to allow Defendants to fully respond to each argument asserted in Plaintiff's Response. Granting the extension will not prejudice Plaintiff, because the two additional pages are not requested for the purpose of asserting new arguments or issues that Plaintiff has not had an opportunity to address in his Response brief. Rather, Defendants respectfully submit that the modest extension will assist the Court's resolution of the issues raised in Defendants' Motion to Dismiss upon briefing that thoroughly addresses the parties' arguments as succinctly as possible. Defendants have made concerted efforts to adhere as closely as possible to the page limits set by the Local Rules while fully addressing the points raised in Plaintiff's Response.

For these reasons, the Court should grant this Motion and allow Defendants to file their Reply on the docket as a separate docket entry.

DATE: November 5, 2021 Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH C. MURPHY, JR. Acting United States Attorney

s/ Audrey M. Calkins
Audrey M. Calkins (TN BPR # 030093)
Audrey.calkins@usdoj.gov
167 N. Main Street, Suite 800
Memphis, TN 38103
901-544-4231

_

¹ The arguments raised by the parties in their briefing on the Motion to Dismiss also were not addressed at the hearing on Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, because Plaintiff represented that his request for a preliminary injunction rested only on the merits of his equal protection challenge to Section 1005 at count one of the Complaint.

Fax: 901-544-4230

BRIAN M. BOYNTON Acting Assistant Attorney General

LESLEY FARBY Assistant Branch Director Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch

/s/ Kyla M. Snow

EMILY SUE NEWTON (VA Bar No. 80745)
Senior Trial Counsel
KYLA M. SNOW (Ohio Bar No. 96662)
Trial Attorney
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
1100 L Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 514-3259 / Fax: (202) 616-8460
Kyla.snow@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF CONSULTATION

I certify that counsel for Defendants conferred with counsel for Plaintiff regarding this Motion, who indicated that Plaintiff opposes this Motion.

s/Kyla M. Snow